




DOCKET NO: 201273US2

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

GREGORY J. MAIER  
(703) 413-3000  
GMAIER@OBLON.COM

EDWIN D. GARLEPP  
SENIOR ASSOCIATE  
(703) 413-3000  
EGARLEPP@OBLON.COM

RE: U.S. Application  
Serial No: 09/745,471  
Filed: December 26, 2000  
Inventor: Minoru Fukuda  
For: Sheet Conveying Device with a Sheet Storage

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

PROVISIONAL ELECTION OF SPECIES

Our check in the amount of \$ --0-- is attached covering any required fees. In the event that any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 CFR 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599  
Edwin D. Garlepp  
Registration No. 45,330



22850

Tel. No.: (703) 413-3000  
Fax No.: (703) 413-2220  
GJM:EDG:eac

RECEIVED  
NOV 19 2002  
GROUP 3600

201273US2



# 1/1  
11-20-02

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF:

:

MINORU FUKUDA

: GROUP ART UNIT: 3652

SERIAL NO: 09/745,471

:

FILED: DECEMBER 26, 2000

: EXAMINER: F. WERNER

FOR: SHEET CONVEYING DEVICE WITH A SHEET STORAGE

PROVISIONAL ELECTION OF SPECIES

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED  
NOV 19 2002  
GROUP 3600

SIR:

In response to the Election Of Species requirement dated October 16, 2002, Applicants provisionally elect Species A of Figures 1-5 for examination on the merits, and identify Claims 1-3, 12-17, 19, 21, 22, 25, 27, 29, 33, 34, 36, 39, 41-43, 51, 52, 54, 55, 58-60, 62, 64, 66-70, 79-84, 86, 88, 89, 92, 94, 96, 99-101, 103, 106, 108-110, 118, 119, 122, 125-129, 131, 133, and 134 as reading on the elected species.

Applicants respectfully traverse the election requirement for several key reasons.

First, the outstanding Official Action merely includes the conclusory statement that "the application contains claims directed to ... patentably distinct species ..." without stating any basis whatsoever in support of such a finding. This is in violation of MPEP §816, which states:

MPEP §816

The particular reasons relied on by the examiner for holding the inventions as claimed are either independent or distinct should be concisely stated. A mere statement of conclusion is inadequate. The reasons upon which the conclusion is based should be given. ...

In the absence of any annunciated basis, it is respectfully submitted that the PTO clearly has not carried forward its burden of proof to establish distinctness.

Secondly, MPEP § 806.04(f) requires:

MPEP § 806.04(f)

Claims to be restricted to different species must be mutually exclusive...

The outstanding Official Action fails to address in any way whether the pending claims recite mutually exclusive characteristics. Applicants therefore further traverse the outstanding election requirement on that basis.

Finally, MPEP § 803 states:

MPEP § 803


... If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

However, the outstanding Restriction Requirement has not established that an undue burden would exist if the Restriction Requirement was not issued and all the claims were examined together. Moreover, the claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully also traverse the outstanding Election requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the requirement to elect a single species be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of Claims 1-134 be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Attorney of Record  
Edwin D. Garlepp  
Registration No. 45,330



**22850**

(703) 413-3000  
Fax #: (703) 413-2220  
GJM:EDG:eac

I:\atty\edg\0557-Ricoh\201273\201273.elec resp.wpd